

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-30 are pending in this application with claims 1 – 3, 12, 15 – 27 and 28 being amended and by this response. Support for these amendments can be found throughout the specification and drawing figures and, more specifically, in paragraphs 16, 21, 23, 27 and 28 of the specification and in Figures 3 and 4 and the corresponding description thereof. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the amendments to the claims.

**Rejection of Claims 28-30 under 35 U.S.C. 101**

Claims 28 – 30 are rejected for failing to be directed towards statutory subject matter. Specifically, the Rejection notes that the action of “perceiving” is an abstract idea and not directed towards statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 28 to recite “displaying the user-defined help message according to a creation time in the help log”. Therefore, the method includes display of messages according to creation time in a the help log that is viewable by a user. Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that amended claim 28 is directed towards statutory subject matter and produces a concrete and tangible result, i.e. messages displayed in a help log based on their time of creation. As claims 29 and 30 are dependent on claim 28, Applicant further respectfully submits that these claims are also directed towards statutory subject matter. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 USC 101 is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claims 1-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)**

Claims 1-30 are rejected under U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sullivan et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,999,990).

Amended claim 1 recites a system for providing help information supporting user operation of at least one executable application. An interface processor receives user entered data representing a help message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for eliminating or reducing the problem and a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of the help message. An identifier identifies a help information repository associated with said help message and a user interface provides a display image including a help message and enables a user to retrieve an

additional document associated with a particular help message from the help information repository. A data processor stores the help message conveying help information in the help information repository in order of creation by using the creation time indicator. For the reasons presented below, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to disclose each feature claimed in amended claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate the present claimed invention.

Sullivan provides a method for automated technical support in a computer network having a client machine, and at least one server from which live help is available. The method initiates a guided self-help session in response to entry by a user of data indicating a problem area and description. During the self-help session, the user is provided with an option to escalate to live help. If the user exercises that option, the system automatically provides a support engineer at the server with a data stream summarizing the self-help session. During the live help, the support engineer may then repeat a portion of the user's self-help session, view information generated during that session, and/or execute certain actions with respect to the user's machine, all from the engineer's desktop. An active journal is maintained for each problem incident, and active journals may be used by other analysts to facilitate problem resolutions for new incidents (See Abstract). However, unlike the present claimed invention Sullivan is merely concerned with providing and transmitting messages indicative of a problem. This is fundamentally different from the present claimed system that provides "help messages" conveying "help information **addressing a recorded problem encountered** in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing said problem**". Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests this feature.

The Rejection cites Figures 4 and 5 and the description on column 7, lines 55 – 67 as providing anticipatory disclosure of the claimed "interface processor". Applicant respectfully disagrees. Specifically, the cited section of Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest "receiving user entered data representing a help message conveying help information" as recited in the present claimed invention. Rather, Sullivan merely provides display of a problem notification identifying that a problem has occurred with a specific application. Nowhere does this disclose or suggest user-entered information for **addressing** a particular "recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application by providing information for **eliminating or reducing** said problem" as recited in the present claimed invention. In fact, column 8, lines 5 – 17 supports Applicants interpretation of the Sullivan system as it clearly states that the system provides a "list of possible 'problem areas'" that may be

selected. This is NOT equivalent to the claimed “help information” that is user entered and received by the claimed “interface processor”. Supplying a list of potential problem areas as in Sullivan is fundamentally different from providing information to a user that addresses a particular problem such that the help information eliminates or reduces the identified problem. The Sullivan system leaves a user to navigate and determine, on their own, what is wrong and how to remedy the situation. This is wholly unlike the present claimed system that provides a user-modifiable online help system that includes relevant instructional information associated with the particular application and which can be provided to users directly to eliminate or reduce problems associated with executable applications.

Additionally, Sullivan does not provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of “a creation time indicator identifying a creation time of said help message” as recited in claim 1. The Rejection cites Figure 19 and column 12, lines 15 – 20 and column 14, lines 20 – 25 in support of the assertion that Sullivan anticipates this feature. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Rather, the cited sections of Sullivan is merely concerned with sending information to a server when live help is requested thereby placing a user in a queue for service (column 12) and also enabling a journaling function for the technical support representative to detail the service provided to the user (column 14). However, neither of these actions are equivalent to “receiving user entered data” for “conveying help information addressing a recorded problem” to a user as in the claimed arrangement. The use of a journal function for quality control as in Sullivan is not equivalent to the claimed arrangement because that information is for use by the system analyst and NOT the user. Moreover, element 160 in Figure 19 represents a time and date of which a **problem** was identified and entered into the Sullivan system to be resolved. This problem identification is NOT a help message because the problem identifier of Sullivan does not “convey help information addressing a recorded problem”. Rather, Figure 19 merely shows the time and date that the problem was reported. There is no mention of resolving the “problem” by “providing information for eliminating or reducing said problem” as in the present claimed invention. Consequently, this feature is also not anticipated by Sullivan.

Sullivan also fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of a “user interface providing a display image including a help message and enabling a user to retrieve an additional document associated with a particular help message from said help information repository” as recited in amended claim 1. Thus, the claimed arrangement advantageously provides user-created help messages for

eliminating or reducing a particular problem for display while simultaneously enabling “a user to retrieve an additional document” that is associated with the help message and the application to which the help message pertains. For example, the claimed arrangement enables display of a help message and also display of a portion of an instruction manual or vendor notice to further aid in reducing or eliminating the problem the user is having with the executable application. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature.

Therefore, as Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest each feature claimed in amended claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan does not anticipate the present invention as claimed in amended claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 2 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 2 is also considered patentable because Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests that the “display image includes a link representative item enabling a user to retrieve said additional document and enables a user to retrieve help message information from said help information repository sorted by creation time using a creation time indicator” as recited in the present claimed invention. As discussed above, Sullivan provides no mechanism for allowing a user to obtain and access an additional document associated with a particular help message. Rather, the Sullivan system provides links to a plurality of different topics associated with a problem message and enables a user to perform “guided self help” to try to resolve the problem (column 8, lines 39 – 67). The selection of documents perceived to be relevant by a user in Sullivan is fundamentally different from the claimed invention which receives a user entered help message that includes help information which addresses **a recorded problem encountered** when using an application and provides targeted information for eliminating or reducing said problem. The present claimed system further enables a user to obtain additional information via a link within the help message. Thus, the claimed system provides targeted application specific support. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Consequently, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Amended claim 3 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 3 is also considered patentable because Sullivan fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of that the “data processor automatically parses a help message and creates a link for retrieving said additional document by converting text into a hyperlink and inserting

said hyperlink in a help message” as in the present claimed invention. Sullivan fails to disclose or suggest providing or receiving “user entered data representing a help message” in any manner. Thus, there is no hint or suggestion that the Sullivan system can parse help messages and create links to additional documentation based on the text of the particular help message.

Additionally, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests that the “data processor automatically deletes said help messages after expiration of a time period from a creation time” as recited in claim 3. The Rejection cites column 14, lines 30 – 32 of Sullivan in support of the assertion that the claimed feature is anticipated. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The cited section of Sullivan fails to provide any enabling disclosure beyond the fact that journal entries may be deleted. Moreover, as discussed above, the journal entries of Sullivan are not equivalent to the present claimed help messages and, even if they were equivalent, there is nothing to suggest automatic deletion of these messages “after expiration of a time period from a creation time” as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests the features of amended claim 3 and does not anticipate claim 3. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 3 is respectfully requested.

Claim 4 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Claim 4 is also considered patentable because Figures 12 and 19 (and the corresponding description) of Sullivan fail to provide 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of the features claimed in claim 4. Specifically, Figures 12 and 19 neither disclose nor suggest that the “creation time indicator includes a creation date indicator and said data processor stores said messages conveying help information in said help information repository in order of creation by using said creation time and date indicator” as recited in claim 4. Rather, Figures 12 and 19 of Sullivan merely show the listing and storage of an problem incident and neither disclose nor suggest storing “help messages” that include help information for addressing a recorded problem. Therefore, the Rejection is correct in the assertion on page four that the “incident” is organized by time and date. However, the incident listing in Sullivan is fundamentally different from a help message that is provided in response to a “problem encountered in using at least one executable application” as in the present claimed invention. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 4 is not anticipated by Sullivan. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 4 is respectfully requested.

Claim 5 is dependent on claim 1 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 is respectfully requested.

Claim 6 is dependent on claim 3 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 3. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 6 is respectfully requested.

Claims 7 – 11 are dependent on claim 1 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 7 – 11 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 12 is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Independent claim 12 is also considered patentable because Sullivan neither discloses nor suggests “a section indicator identifying a section of said help information repository associated with said help messages and said interface processor initiates searching of said help information repository to identify help messages in response to user command” as recited in amended claim 12. Sullivan merely provides lists of potential problem areas and enables a user to self-help based on lists of topics that may be related. Sullivan does not provide a “message conveying help information addressing a recorded problem encountered in using at least one executable application”. Additionally, as no help messages are disclosed or suggested by Sullivan, there is no mechanism by which to search a help information repository to identify help messages that may be used in eliminating or reducing the problem encountered by a user. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claims 13 – 14 are dependent on claim 12 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 12. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 13 and 14 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 15 is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 is dependent on claim 15 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 15. Claim 16 is also considered

patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 2. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16 is respectfully requested.

Claim 17 is dependent on claim 15 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 15. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 17 is respectfully requested.

Claim 18 is dependent on claim 15 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 15. Claim 18 is also considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 3. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 18 is respectfully requested.

Claim 19 is dependent on claim 15 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 15. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 19 is respectfully requested.

Independent claims 20 – 23 are each considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 20 -23 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 24 is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is respectfully requested.

Claim 25 is dependent on claim 24 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 24. Claim 25 is also considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 2. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 25 is respectfully requested.

Claim 26 is dependent on claim 24 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 24. Claim 26 is also considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 3. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 26 is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 is dependent on claim 24 and is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 24. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 27 is respectfully requested.

Independent claim 28 is considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claim 1. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 24 is respectfully requested.


Claims 29 and 30 are dependent on claim 28 and are considered patentable for the reasons presented above with respect to claims 1 and 28. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 29 and 30 is respectfully requested.

In view of the above remarks and amendments to the claims, Applicant respectfully submits that Sullivan fails to provide any 35 USC 112 compliant enabling disclosure of the present claimed invention. Consequently, withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 30 under 35 USC 102(b) is respectfully requested.

Having fully addressed the Examiner's rejections, it is believed that, in view of the preceding amendments and remarks, this application stands in condition for allowance. Accordingly then, reconsideration and allowance are respectfully solicited. If, however, the Examiner is of the opinion that such action cannot be taken, the Examiner is invited to contact the applicant's attorney at the phone number below, so that a mutually convenient date and time for a telephonic interview may be scheduled.

Respectfully submitted,  
Thomas W. Hathaway

Date: July 30, 2007

By:   
Alexander J. Burke  
Reg. No. 40,425

Siemens Corporation  
Customer No. 28524  
Tel 732 321 3023  
Fax 732 321 3030